

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 282

VT 000 015

HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF ASSISTANCE NEEDED IN ORDER TO DEVELOP MORE ADEQUATE PROGRAMS FOR EMPLOYMENT-BOUND YOUTH.

BY- WENRICH, RALPH C. OLLENBURGER, ALVIN
MICHIGAN UNIV., ANN ARBOR, SCH. OF EDUCATION

REPORT NUMBER D5678-1-F

PUB DATE DEC 63

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.09 HC-\$2.08 52P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FEDERAL AID, QUESTIONNAIRES, *STATE AID, HIGH SCHOOLS, HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, OUT OF SCHOOL YOUTH, *PRINCIPALS, OCCUPATIONAL GUIDANCE, OPINIONS, ANN ARBOR

QUESTIONNAIRES WERE SENT TO PRINCIPALS OF LARGE HIGH SCHOOLS IN MICHIGAN TO DETERMINE THE KINDS OF FEDERAL AND STATE ASSISTANCE THEY WOULD CONSIDER MOST HELPFUL IN DEVELOPING AND OPERATING SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES FOR EMPLOYMENT-BOUND YOUTH. RESPONSES WERE RECEIVED FROM 123, OR 98.4 PERCENT. QUESTIONS COVERED SIX AREAS OF ACTIVITY--(1) EXAMINING THE GOALS OF THE SCHOOL AND EVALUATING THE OFFERINGS AVAILABLE TO EMPLOYMENT-BOUND YOUTH, (2) ASSESSING THE NEEDS OF IN-SCHOOL AND OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH AND THE NEEDS OF EMPLOYERS, (3) DEVELOPING NEW PROGRAMS TO MEET THE NEEDS OF YOUTH AND EMPLOYERS, (4) OPERATING SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO PREPARE IN-SCHOOL YOUTH FOR EMPLOYMENT, (5) OPERATING SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO PREPARE OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH FOR EMPLOYMENT, AND (6) PROVIDING MORE ADEQUATE VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE SERVICES FOR IN-SCHOOL AND OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH. THE AREAS OF ACTIVITY WERE PLACED IN RANK-ORDER BY THE PRINCIPALS AND AREA 2 AND AREA 4 WERE RANKED FIRST AND SECOND, RESPECTIVELY. A MAJORITY OF THE PRINCIPALS FELT THAT THEY DID NOT HAVE TIME TO GIVE LEADERSHIP TO THE PROGRAMS FOR EMPLOYMENT-BOUND YOUTH AND NEARLY THREE-FOURTHS FELT THEIR PROGRAMS COULD BE IMPROVED IF FUNDS WERE MADE AVAILABLE TO PROVIDE AN EXTRA ASSISTANT FOR THIS LEADERSHIP. TABLES OF PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES, THE QUESTIONNAIRE, AND RECOMMENDATIONS ARE INCLUDED. (PS)

DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
AND PRACTICAL ARTS
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

05678-1-F

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

High School Principals' Perceptions of Assistance Needed in Order to Develop More Adequate Programs for Employment-Bound Youth

**RALPH C. WENRICH
ALVIN OLLENBURGER**

Sponsored by:

**State Board of Control for Vocational Education
Lansing, Michigan**

Administered through:

December 1963

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION • ANN ARBOR

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF ASSISTANCE NEEDED IN ORDER
TO DEVELOP MORE ADEQUATE PROGRAMS FOR EMPLOYMENT-BOUND YOUTH

Ralph C. Wenrich
Alvin Ollenburger

ORA Project 05678

sponsored by:

STATE BOARD OF CONTROL FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
LANSING, MICHIGAN

administered through:

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

ANN ARBOR

December 1963

FOREWORD

In the spring of 1961 The University of Michigan did a study of the effect of withdrawal of reimbursement on high school vocational programs; the study was done as a part of the Michigan Vocational Education Evaluation Project. The majority of local school administrators, as revealed in the 1961 study, felt that if the special reimbursement provided for high school vocational programs were to be gradually eliminated (over a three-year period), their programs would be continued without special aid.

The study reported here is an attempt to determine, for the guidance of the State Board of Control for Vocational Education, how vocational education funds might best be spent in order to aid high school principals and their faculties in developing more adequate educational experiences appropriate to the needs of employment-bound youth.

Although the Project Director takes full responsibility for the study, he had the assistance of many of his colleagues. In designing the study Dr. Ned Flanders, Professor of Education and Research Consultant, was most helpful; in constructing the questionnaire, Dr. Morris Axelrod, Survey Research Center, gave valuable assistance; and in decisions regarding statistical procedures and data processing, Dr. M. Clemens Johnson, Associate Professor of Education and Research Associate, served the project well. Particular credit should be given to Alvin Ollenburger, Assistant in Research for the project, who gave unstintingly of his time and talents.

Ralph C. Wenrich
Project Director

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | vii |
| PART | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| A. Statement of the Problem | 1 |
| B. Objective of the Study | 1 |
| C. Scope of the Study | 2 |
| D. Procedure | 2 |
| II. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY | 3 |
| A. Six Areas of Activity for Improvement of Programs for Employment-bound Youth | 3 |
| 1. Comparing the responses for the six areas of activity | 3 |
| 2. Comparing responses for areas one, two, and three, when schools are classified according to size, percentage of students entering college, and percentage of drop-outs | 4 |
| 3. Assistance desired by principals in areas one, two, and three | 4 |
| 4. Comparing responses for areas four, five, and six, when schools are classified according to size, percentage of students entering college, and per- centage of drop-outs | 4 |
| 5. Assistance desired by principals in areas four, five, and six. | 5 |
| B. What the Schools Have Done in the Past Two Years in Areas One, Two, and Three | 5 |
| 1. What the schools have done in area one | 5 |
| 2. What the schools have done in area two | 5 |
| 3. What the schools have done in area three | 6 |
| C. Miscellaneous Questions Bearing on a Program for Employment-bound Youth | 6 |

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Concluded)

| PART | Page |
|---|------|
| III. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 7 |
| A. Summary | 7 |
| B. Conclusions | 8 |
| C. Recommendations | 9 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | Page |
|--|------|
| I. Number of Questionnaires Sent and Percent Returned | 10 |
| II. Grade Span of Schools Responding | 10 |
| III. Enrollment of Schools Responding | 10 |
| IV. Principals' Responses to the Question in Regard to Each of the Six Areas | 11 |
| V. Rankings given the Six Areas | 11 |
| VI. Opinions of Principals, by School Size, in Answer to Question 3 | 12 |
| VII. Opinions of Principals, by College Percentage, in Answer to Question 3 | 12 |
| VIII. Opinions of Principals, by Percent of Drop-Outs, in Answer to Question 3 | 13 |
| IX. Opinions of Principals, by School Size, in Answer to Question 2 | 13 |
| X. Opinions of Principals, by College Percentage, in Answer to Question 2 | 14 |
| XI. Opinions of Principals, by Percent of Drop-Outs, in Answer to Question 2 | 14 |
| XII. Opinions of Principals, by School Size, in Answer to Question 3 | 15 |
| XIII. Opinions of Principals, by College Percentage, in Answer to Question 3 | 15 |
| XIV. Opinions of Principals, by Percent of Drop-Outs, in Answer to Question 3 | 16 |

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

| TABLE | Page |
|---|------|
| XV. Individuals Preferred by Principals to Help in Areas 1, 2, and 3 | 16 |
| XVI. Principals' Opinions on Three Types of Assistance for Area 1 | 17 |
| XVII. Principals' Opinions on Three Types of Assistance for Area 2 | 17 |
| XVIII. Principals' Opinions on Three Types of Assistance for Area 3 | 18 |
| XIX. Opinions of Principals, by School Size, in Answer to Question 1 | 18 |
| XX. Opinions of Principals, by College Percentage, in Answer to Question 1 | 19 |
| XXI. Opinions of Principals by Percent of Drop-Outs, in Answer to Question 1 | 19 |
| XXII. Opinions of Principals, by School Size, in Answer to Question 1 | 20 |
| XXIII. Opinions of Principals, by College Percentage, in Answer to Question 1 | 20 |
| XXIV. Opinions of Principals, by Percent of Drop-Outs, in Answer to Question 1 | 21 |
| XXV. Opinions of Principals, by School Size, in Answer to Question 1 | 21 |
| XXVI. Opinions of Principals, by College Percentage, in Answer to Question 1 | 22 |
| XXVII. Opinions of Principals, by Percent of Drop-Outs, in Answer to Question 1 | 22 |

LIST OF TABLES (Concluded)

| TABLE | Page |
|--|------|
| XXVIII. Help Preferred by Principals in Areas 4, 5, and 6 | 23 |
| XXIX. What Schools Have Done About Three Types of Activities in Area 1 | 23 |
| XXX. How Often Principals Involve Others, From Outside the School, in Area 1 | 24 |
| XXXI. What Schools Have Done About Three Types of Surveys in Area 2 | 24 |
| XXXII. Number of Schools Having Various Programs in Operation | 25 |
| XXXIII. How Often Principals Involve Others, From Outside the School, in Area 3 | 25 |
| XXXIV. Answers to Various Questions About Existing Conditions for Employment-bound Youth | 26 |

PART I. INTRODUCTION

A. Statement of the Problem

In the spring of 1961 a survey¹ was made of superintendents, high school principals, and directors of vocational education in Michigan to determine what the effect would be on reimbursed high school vocational programs if the reimbursement were gradually withdrawn (over a three-year period). Most administrators felt that their programs would continue to operate without reimbursement. In relation to homemaking, 89% said their programs would continue; 79% felt that their trade and industrial programs would continue; 75% thought their cooperative occupational training programs would continue; and 61% expressed the same opinion about agricultural education.

In the same survey approximately two-thirds of the local administrators expressed the thought that if, in the future, state and federal vocational funds were no longer used to support the present high school vocational offerings, these funds should be used to stimulate the further development of new vocational programs and services for high school youth. Less than one-third thought these funds should be used for the development of out-of-school youth and adult programs.

It can be assumed that the State Board of Control for Vocational Education will make some changes in the allocation of earmarked vocational education funds. Therefore, in revising policies, information regarding the kinds of assistance high school principals consider to be most essential in the development of more adequate programs for employment-bound youth would be helpful.

B. Objective of the Study

The objective of the study was to determine what kinds of assistance high school principals would consider most helpful in developing and/or operating special programs and services for employment-bound youth.

¹Ralph C. Wenrich. A Study to Determine More Effective Ways of Using State and Federal Vocational Education Funds in the Further Development of Programs Operated by Local School Districts. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Office of Research Administration, July 1962.

C. Scope of the Study

The study included all Michigan high school principals of schools with a student population of 700 or more in grades 10-12, of 1,000 or more in grades 9-12, and of 1,600 or more in grades 7-12. The study was limited to large high schools because it was felt that specialized education for employment, especially in industrial and service occupations, is feasible only in larger schools.

D. Procedure

A list was made of the many kinds of assistance high school principals said they would find helpful; this was done by interviewing principals, professors of secondary school administration and curriculum, Bureau of School Services personnel, and others. The activities in which principals said they would like assistance were categorized and six areas of activity were established (see Part II, Section A).

A questionnaire was constructed and pre-tested by giving it to a number of staff members and high school principals who were not included in the population to be surveyed. The questionnaire was then revised to eliminate ambiguities.

The Michigan Education Directory was used to determine the schools which were large enough to be included in the study. Early in May questionnaires were sent to the 125 principals of these schools with a cover letter [see Appendix, p. A3]. A duplicate questionnaire, with the same cover letter and an insert [p. A4] was mailed ten days after the first mailing to those who had not yet responded.

Responses were received from 123 principals, but three of these did not qualify on the basis of size of school enrollment. Table I shows the number of questionnaires sent out and the number and percent (98.4) returned. Tables II and III show the distribution of schools whose principals responded by grade span and by enrollment respectively. It should be noted that most of the schools operate three grades and that there is a fairly even distribution of schools by size.

PART II. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

A. Six Areas of Activity for Improvement of Programs for Employment-bound Youth

For this study the entire process of improving a program for employment-bound youth was divided into six areas of activity:

Area One. Examining the goals of the school and evaluating the offerings available to employment-bound youth.

Area Two. Assessing the needs of in-school and out-of-school youth and the needs of employers.

Area Three. Developing new programs to meet the needs of youth and employers.

Area Four. Operating specialized programs designed to prepare in-school youth for employment.

Area Five. Operating specialized programs designed to prepare out-of-school youth for employment.

Area Six. Providing more adequate vocational guidance services for in-school and out-of-school youth.

The respondents were asked the following question for each of these areas: If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated, what part of these funds do you think should be spent to help you--(in a particular area). The choices for answering this question were NONE, LITTLE, SOME, MOST, and ALL.

For readability and to save space, these areas will be referred to by number throughout the rest of this report. The questionnaire and letter of transmittal are reproduced in the Appendix.

1. COMPARING THE RESPONSES FOR THE SIX AREAS OF ACTIVITY

Very few respondents felt that ALL of the reallocated funds should be spent to help them in any one area (see Table IV). The highest percentages are found for SOME with approximately 50 percent of those responding giving this answer in each of the six areas. Following SOME, the next highest percentages are for MOST in all six areas.

The principals were asked to rank three of the six areas in order of preference for assistance. Area Two was given a rank of 1 most often (by 33 principals). These rankings were then weighted and the six areas rank-ordered. After weighting, Area Two was ranked first and Area Four second (see Table V). It should be noted that Areas Two and Four, which were ranked first and second respectively, have the highest percentage of non-response (see Table IV).

2. COMPARING RESPONSES FOR AREAS ONE, TWO, AND THREE, WHEN SCHOOLS ARE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SIZE, PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ENTERING COLLEGE, AND PERCENTAGE OF DROP-OUTS

Only minor differences can be found in the principals' opinions regarding Areas One, Two, and Three whether their schools are classified according to size, percentage of students entering college, or percentage of drop-outs (see Tables VI-XIV). One such difference is that principals of schools with enrollments of 1,000-1,299 and of 2,500 or more thought MOST of the reallocated funds should be spent to help them in Area Three (see Table XII).

3. ASSISTANCE DESIRED BY PRINCIPALS IN AREAS ONE, TWO, AND THREE

The principals who answered SOME, MOST, or ALL to the question about funds for help in Areas One, Two, and Three were asked several questions about what individuals they would prefer to help them in a particular area. The highest percentage of the principals answering these questions favored members of their own staff in all three areas. The principals' next choice was individuals from the community (see Table XV).

When asked what besides help from people they would want to aid them in these areas, a large percentage of principals answered favorably to all of the types of assistance listed in the questionnaire (see Tables XVI, XVII, and XVIII). Of the principals asked to respond to this question, the smallest percentage (69) wanted sample evaluation forms for aid in Area One.

4. COMPARING RESPONSES FOR AREAS FOUR, FIVE, AND SIX, WHEN SCHOOLS ARE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SIZE, PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ENTERING COLLEGE, AND PERCENTAGE OF DROP-OUTS

The same situation exists for these three areas as for Areas One, Two, and Three: namely, only minor differences in principals' opinions show up no matter which way their schools are classified (see Tables

XIX-XXVII).

5. ASSISTANCE DESIRED BY PRINCIPALS IN AREAS FOUR, FIVE, AND SIX

The principals who answered SOME, MOST, or ALL to the question about funds for help in Areas Four, Five, and Six were asked a question about what kind of assistance they would want. Instructional materials were checked most often in Areas Four and Five, while guidance materials were checked most often in Area Six (see Table XXVIII). For Area Six, "Counselors aware of the problems of employment-bound youth" was checked almost as often as guidance materials, whereas the second choice for Areas Four and Five was equipment and consultation services. The type of help checked the least, for these three areas, was supervising and administering the programs (see Table XXVIII).

B. What the Schools Have Done in the Past Two Years in Areas One, Two, and Three

1. WHAT THE SCHOOLS HAVE DONE IN AREA ONE

Three activities that could be carried on in this area were listed in the questionnaire. About two-thirds (79 of the 120) of the schools have made a follow-up study of graduates within the last two years. A little over one-third of the schools (43 and 46 schools respectively) have made a follow-up study of drop-outs and held a conference on the role of the school in educating the employment-bound youth (see Table XXIX).

The large number of principals who did not respond to these questions (29 did not answer the question on a follow-up study of drop-outs and 30 did not answer the question on a conference on the role of the school) leads to some interesting speculation.

When asked how often groups from outside the school are involved in the activities of this area, 17 principals checked NEVER and 69 checked SOMETIMES (see Table XXX).

2. WHAT THE SCHOOLS HAVE DONE IN AREA TWO

It should be kept in mind that Area Two was rank-ordered first in order of preference for assistance by the principals. Three kinds of surveys were listed for this area and principals were asked if they had

done any of them within the past two years. A majority of the 120 schools had done none of the three surveys listed (see Table XXXI). The fact that only 23 schools have attempted to identify the needs of out-of-school youths indicates where assistance could start in this area.

3. WHAT THE SCHOOLS HAVE DONE IN AREA THREE

Principals were asked to check whether or not they had any of five programs in operation at that time. A little over half, 66 of the 120, of the schools had in operation a program slanted towards employment-bound youth (see Table XXXII). Eighty-two of the schools had in operation a program for slow readers and slow learners to give them a saleable skill.

With regard to involving groups from outside the school in this area, 59 principals said they SOMETIMES ask them and 21 said they NEVER do (see Table XXXIII).

C. Miscellaneous Questions Bearing On A Program for Employment-bound Youth

Of the 120 principals, 109 accepted as a goal for their school the responsibility for giving employment-bound youth saleable skills, but only 87 felt that their schools reflect this goal in the courses they offer (see Table XXXIV). Only 19 schools felt they are doing all that can be expected of them for employment-bound in-school youth. Sixty-six principals felt they do not have enough time to give leadership to a program for employment-bound youth and 89 felt that a wise use of part of the earmarked funds would be to furnish an extra assistant to give this leadership (see Table XXXIV).

PART III. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary

In the spring of 1961 a study was made which indicated that most administrators felt their vocational programs would continue to operate even if reimbursement were to be withdrawn; administrators also expressed the idea that if in the future federal and state vocational education funds were no longer used as reimbursement for the salaries of high school teachers in the same manner as in the past, these funds should be used to stimulate further development of vocational programs and services for high school youth.

Consequently, the present study was designed to determine the kinds of assistance high school principals would consider helpful in planning and operating programs and services for employment-bound youth. It was thought, furthermore, that the findings of this study would assist the State Board of Control for Vocational Education in making changes in policy regarding the use of vocational education funds.

By interviewing high school principals, professors of secondary school administration and curriculum, and others, a list was made of the kinds of assistance high school principals might find helpful; these were grouped into six categories or areas of activity. A questionnaire was constructed to determine the areas in which principals would like to have help and the kinds of assistance preferred.

The principals were asked to indicate on a scale of five choices, NONE, LITTLE, SOME, MOST, and ALL, what part of the state and federal earmarked funds should be spent for help in each of the six areas of activity. Approximately one-half of the principals felt that SOME state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education should be reallocated to help them improve their programs for employment-bound youth in each of the six areas. If the responses of SOME and MOST are combined we see that approximately three-fourths of the principals favored spending either SOME or MOST of the funds for each of the six areas.

When the areas of activity were placed in rank order by the principals, Area Two (assessing the needs of in-school and out-of-school youth and employers) and Area Four (operating specialized programs to prepare in-school youth for employment) were ranked first and second, respectively.

Few differences in opinions as to what part of the earmarked funds should be spent in each of the areas of activity were found among schools, whether schools were classified according to size, percentage of students entering

college, or percent of drop-outs, but principals with an enrollment of 1000-1299 students felt that MOST of the reallocated funds should be spent to help them in Area Three which was "developing new programs to meet the needs of youth and the needs of employers."

If help is given by making it possible for one or more individuals to work in Area One, Two, or Three, principals would prefer to have such services performed by members of their own staff and next in order of preference, by other individuals from the community.

Principals favored assistance in the form of instructional materials in Areas Four and Five and guidance materials in Area Six. Next in order of preference was (for Area Six) more and better counselors aware of the problem of employment-bound youth, and (for Areas Four and Five) consultation services and equipment.

Only 23 principals said that their schools have attempted to identify the needs of out-of-school youth and only 44 indicated any attempt to identify the needs of in-school youth. Over half of the principals were of the opinion their school had a program slanted toward employment-bound youth.

Of the 120 principals, 109 accepted as a goal for their school the responsibility for giving employment-bound youth saleable skills, but only 87 felt their schools reflected this goal in the courses they offer. Only 19 principals felt their schools were doing all that could be expected of them for employment-bound in-school youth and only 22 principals felt this way about out-of-school youth.

Sixty-six principals felt they did not have enough time to give leadership to the development of programs for employment-bound youth and 89 principals felt an extra assistant would be helpful in providing leadership.

B. Conclusions

The fact that over 98% of the principals returned the questionnaire and that three-fourths of the responding principals favored spending either SOME or MOST of earmarked vocational funds to help them improve their programs for employment-bound youth, indicates how serious and important are the problems of employment-bound youth to the principals of Michigan high schools.

When the task of improving the program for employment-bound youth was divided into six areas of activity, principals did not single out any one particular area for assistance; they favored help for the entire task. When principals were presented with the possibility that perhaps assistance cannot be given in all areas of activity, principals ranked first, in order of preference for assistance, an assessment of the needs of in-school and out-of-school youth and employers.

If assistance is given to improve programs for employment-bound youth, these principals want help from members of their staff and individuals from the community to work on such improvement. Also they want assistance in obtaining more and better instructional and guidance materials.

A majority of the principals felt that they did not have time to give leadership to the programs for employment-bound youth and nearly three-fourths of them felt their programs could be improved if funds were made available to provide an extra assistant to give this leadership.

In the principals' opinion, the schools included in this study are not doing enough for either in-school or out-of-school youth who are looking toward employment rather than college, even though over half of the schools have a program designed specifically for employment-bound youth.

C. Recommendations

It is recommended that the State Board of Control for Vocational Education:

1. Continue to allocate a substantial portion of the funds made available annually to the development of programs and services for youth of high school age. Furthermore, funds should be made available to encourage and support activities in each of the six areas identified in the study:

Area One. Examining the goals of the school and evaluating offerings available to employment-bound youth.

Area Two. Assessing the needs of in-school and out-of-school youth and the needs of employers.

Area Three. Developing new programs to meet the needs of youth and employers.

Area Four. Operating specialized programs designed to prepare in-school youth for employment.

Area Five. Operating specialized programs designed to prepare out-of-school youth for employment.

Area Six. Providing more adequate vocational guidance services for in-school and out-of-school youth.

2. Make a special effort to assist high school principals and their faculties (1) to assess the needs of youth of high school age—both those in school and those out of school—and (2) to assess the needs of employers in the service areas of the school. This can be achieved in a number of ways:

a. By reimbursing school districts for the salaries of personnel assigned (full- or part-time) to the task of studying needs.

b. By having vocational education consultants in the State Department of Public Instruction give top priority to assisting school districts in the study of needs of youth and needs of employers.

c. By developing plans and procedures (including instruments) which any high school faculty can use in (1) making interest inventories, (2) conducting follow-up studies of drop-outs and graduates who have gone directly into employment, (3) surveying employment opportunities for youth, (4) determining

the requirements of jobs available to youth, (5) working effectively with lay advisory committees, (6) other techniques which will result in the more accurate assessment of community needs.

3. Adopt reimbursement policies which will make available more time of high school administrators and their faculties to engage in activities other than instructional, such as planning and developmental materials.

4. Allocate more funds to the development of instructional materials and guidance materials.

5. Publish annually a report on programs and practices which are outstanding; pilot and experimental programs should be included.

6. Provide consultant services on a team basis to high schools interested in evaluating their total program for employment-bound youth in relation to community needs.

7. Encourage the recruitment and preparation of more qualified instructors and counselors, instructors who have appropriate experience in employment outside the school and counselors who are aware of the problems of employment-bound youth.

8. Adopt reimbursement policies which will encourage boards of education to give principals of high schools large enough to operate specialized vocational programs an assistant (full- or part-time) whose responsibility it would be to give leadership to the development of more meaningful programs for employment-bound youth.

TABLE I. NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES
SENT AND PERCENT RETURNED

| <u>Position</u> | <u>Sent</u> | <u>Received</u> | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|----------|
| | | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
| Principals | 125 | 123* | 98.4 |

*Since 3 of the 123 received were not of the required size, the following tables are compiled on the basis of 120 respondents.

TABLE II. GRADE SPAN OF SCHOOLS RESPONDING

| <u>Grade Span</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
|----------------------|----------|----------|
| Three grades (10-12) | 74 | 62 |
| Four grades (9-12) | 37 | 31 |
| Five grades (8-12) | 2 | 1 |
| Six grades (7-12) | 7 | 6 |
| Total | 120 | 100 |

TABLE III. ENROLLMENT OF SCHOOLS RESPONDING

| <u>Enrollment</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
|-------------------|----------|----------|
| 700- 999 | 12 | 10 |
| 1000-1299 | 26 | 22 |
| 1300-1599 | 13 | 11 |
| 1600-1899 | 26 | 22 |
| 1900-2199 | 13 | 11 |
| 2200-2499 | 15 | 12 |
| 2500 or more | 15 | 12 |
| Total | 120 | 100 |

TABLE IV. PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION*
IN REGARD TO EACH OF THE SIX AREAS

| Answer | Areas of Activity, % | | | | | |
|-------------|----------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| NONE | 8 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 6 |
| LITTLE | 12 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 17 |
| SOME | 53 | 44 | 44 | 46 | 53 | 52 |
| MOST | 23 | 25 | 37 | 33 | 23 | 18 |
| ALL | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| No Response | 3 | 12 | 4 | 11 | 8 | 7 |
| TOTAL | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

*If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated, what part of these funds do you think should be spent to help you (in a particular area)?

TABLE V. RANKINGS GIVEN THE SIX AREAS

| Rank Given | Areas of Activity | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1 | 12 | 33 | 15 | 27 | 9 | 10 |
| 2 | 9 | 19 | 20 | 24 | 19 | 10 |
| 3 | 10 | 15 | 26 | 16 | 14 | 19 |
| WEIGHTED RANK* | 64 | 152 | 111 | 145 | 79 | 69 |
| RANK ORDER | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 |

*A rank of 1 was given a weight of 3, a rank of 2 was given a weight of 2, and a rank of 3 was given a weight of 1.

TABLE VI. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY SCHOOL SIZE,
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 3, PAGE A7

(Area 1)

| Answer | Enrollment** | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-------|
| | 700- 999 | 1000- 1299 | 1300- 1599 | 1600- 1899 | 1900- 2199 | 2200- 2499 | 2500 or More | |
| NONE | 1 | 2 | 2 | - | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| LITTLE | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 14 |
| SOME | 7 | 12 | 8 | 17 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 64 |
| MOST | 2 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 27 |
| ALL | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| No Response | 1 | - | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 4 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 26 | 13 | 26 | 13 | 15 | 15 | 120 |

*If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated: What part of these funds do you think should be spent to help evaluate the offerings and examine the goals of your school?

**The frequency tables from two classifications, enrollment and grade size, were statistically checked by Chi square for independence, and no independence was found. Since either classification or grouping will give the same results, tables by enrollment, only, were reported.

TABLE VII. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY COLLEGE PERCENTAGE,*
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 3, PAGE A7

(Area 1)

| Answer | College Percentage | | | | | Total |
|-------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 0-19 | 20-39 | 40-59 | 60-79 | 80-100 | |
| NONE | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | - | 10 |
| LITTLE | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 14 |
| SOME | 5 | 20 | 31 | 7 | 1 | 64 |
| MOST | 1 | 12 | 11 | - | 2 | 26 |
| ALL | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| No Response | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 4 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 38 | 52 | 13 | 4 | 119** |

*College percentage: percent of last year's graduating class that entered college.

**Since one school did not give its college percentage, the Grand Total was 120.

TABLE VIII. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY PERCENT OF DROP-OUTS,*
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 3, PAGE A7

(Area 1)

| Answer | Percent of Drop-Outs | | | | | Total |
|-------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|-------|
| | 0-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40 or More | |
| NONE | 2 | 4 | 2 | - | 1 | 9 |
| LITTLE | 6 | 1 | 6 | - | - | 13 |
| SOME | 18 | 20 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 61 |
| MOST | 5 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 25 |
| ALL | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| No Response | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | 2 |
| TOTAL | 32 | 36 | 28 | 9 | 6 | 111** |

*Percent of drop-outs: percent of those who entered the 9th grade in 1959 and are not now attending school.

**Since 9 schools did not give their percent of drop-outs, the Grand Total was 120.

TABLE IX. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY SCHOOL SIZE,
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 2*, PAGE A9

(Area 2)

| Answer | Enrollment | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-------|
| | 700-999 | 1000-1299 | 1300-1599 | 1600-1899 | 1900-2199 | 2200-2499 | 2500 or More | |
| NONE | - | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| LITTLE | - | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 14 |
| SOME | 9 | 11 | 6 | 12 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 53 |
| MOST | 3 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 30 |
| ALL | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| No Response | - | 7 | 1 | 4 | - | 1 | 2 | 15 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 26 | 13 | 26 | 13 | 15 | 15 | 120 |

*If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated: What part of these funds do you think should be spent to help assess the needs of in-school and out-of-school youth and the needs of employers?

TABLE X. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY COLLEGE PERCENTAGE,*
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 2, PAGE A9

(Area 2)

| Answer | College Percentage | | | | | Total |
|-------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 0-19 | 20-39 | 40-59 | 60-79 | 80-100 | |
| NONE | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | 7 |
| LITTLE | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| SOME | 5 | 15 | 23 | 8 | 2 | 53 |
| MOST | 1 | 12 | 16 | 1 | - | 30 |
| ALL | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
| No Response | 2 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 38 | 52 | 13 | 4 | 119** |

*College percentage: percent of last year's graduating class that entered college.

**Since one school did not give its college percentage, the Grand Total was 120.

TABLE XI. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY PERCENT OF DROP-OUTS,*
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 2, PAGE A9

(Area 2)

| Answer | Percent of Drop-Outs | | | | | Total |
|-------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|-------|
| | 0-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40 or More | |
| NONE | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | 7 |
| LITTLE | 5 | - | 6 | - | 1 | 12 |
| SOME | 13 | 18 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 51 |
| MOST | 7 | 12 | 6 | 3 | - | 28 |
| ALL | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| No Response | 5 | 4 | 2 | - | 1 | 12 |
| TOTAL | 32 | 36 | 28 | 9 | 6 | 111** |

*Percent of drop-outs: percent of those who entered the 9th grade in 1959 and are not now attending school.

**Since 9 schools did not give their percent of drop-outs, the Grand Total was 120.

TABLE XII. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY SCHOOL SIZE,
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 3*, PAGE A11

(Area 3)

| Answer | Enrollment | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-------|
| | 700- 999 | 1000- 1299 | 1300- 1599 | 1600- 1899 | 1900- 2199 | 2200- 2499 | 2500 or More | |
| NONE | - | 2 | - | - | 1 | - | 2 | 5 |
| LITTLE | - | 3 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| SOME | 8 | 8 | 8 | 14 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 53 |
| MOST | 3 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 44 |
| ALL | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 4 |
| No Response | - | 2 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 5 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 26 | 13 | 26 | 13 | 15 | 15 | 120 |

*If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated: What part of these funds do you think should be spent to help develop new programs to meet the needs of youth and employers in your community?

TABLE XIII. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY COLLEGE PERCENTAGE,*
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 3, PAGE A11

(Area 3)

| Answer | College Percentage | | | | | | Total |
|-------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--|-------|
| | 0-19 | 20-39 | 40-59 | 60-79 | 80-100 | | |
| NONE | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | | 5 |
| LITTLE | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 9 |
| SOME | 6 | 14 | 27 | 6 | - | | 53 |
| MOST | 2 | 16 | 18 | 4 | 3 | | 43 |
| ALL | - | 1 | 3 | - | - | | 4 |
| No Response | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | | 5 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 38 | 52 | 13 | 4 | | 119** |

*College percentage: percent of last year's graduating class that entered college.

**Since one school did not give its college percentage, the Grand Total was 120.

TABLE XIV. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY PERCENT OF DROP-OUTS,*
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 3, PAGE A11

(Area 3)

| Answer | Percent of Drop-Outs | | | | | Total |
|-------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|-------|
| | 0-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40 or More | |
| NONE | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| LITTLE | 3 | - | 5 | - | - | 8 |
| SOME | 13 | 17 | 13 | 5 | 3 | 51 |
| MOST | 13 | 14 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 39 |
| ALL | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 4 |
| No Response | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 3 |
| TOTAL | 32 | 36 | 28 | 9 | 6 | 111** |

*Percent of drop-outs: percent of those who entered the 9th grade in 1959 and are not now attending school.

**Since 9 schools did not give their percent of drop-outs, the Grand Total was 120.

TABLE XV. INDIVIDUALS PREFERRED BY PRINCIPALS
TO HELP IN AREAS 1, 2, AND 3

| Individuals | Percent Answering Yes* | | |
|---|------------------------|--------|--------|
| | Area 1 | Area 2 | Area 3 |
| Members of your staff | 88 | 82 | 92 |
| A group of principals from other schools | 22 | 11 | 13 |
| Personnel from the State Department of Public Instruction | 58 | 53 | 57 |
| Individuals from the community | 85 | 77 | 87 |
| A consultant or survey team from a college or university | 58 | 59 | 61 |
| Number answering** | 96 | 99 | 106 |

*See Appendix, question 4, page A8; question 3, page A10; question 4, page A12.

**The percentages listed are of the number of principals who answered SOME, MOST, or ALL, for the area involved.

TABLE XVI. PRINCIPALS' OPINIONS ON THREE TYPES
OF ASSISTANCE FOR AREA 1

| Type of Assistance | Percent Answering* | | |
|--|--------------------|----|-------------|
| | Yes | No | No Response |
| Sample evaluation forms | 69 | 16 | 15 |
| Standards to evaluate by | 77 | 7 | 16 |
| Written plan or procedure to carry on such activities | 82 | 4 | 14 |

*Answers to this question: What, besides help from people, would you want to aid you in Area 1?

TABLE XVII. PRINCIPALS' OPINIONS ON THREE TYPES
OF ASSISTANCE FOR AREA 2

| Type of Assistance | Percent Answering* | | |
|---|--------------------|----|-------------|
| | Yes | No | No Response |
| Materials used for assessing youths' needs | 91 | 3 | 6 |
| Materials used for assessing employers' needs | 91 | 3 | 6 |
| Methods to evaluate data after it is collected | 87 | 3 | 10 |

*Answers to this question: What, besides the services of people, would you want to help you in Area 2?

TABLE XVIII. PRINCIPALS' OPINIONS ON THREE TYPES
OF ASSISTANCE FOR AREA 3

| Type of Assistance | Percent Answering* | | |
|--|--------------------|----|-------------|
| | Yes | No | No Response |
| A sample pilot program to study and compare with | 81 | 10 | 9 |
| Samples of new instructional materials | 85 | 7 | 8 |
| Information on new or better equipment for such programs | 81 | 9 | 10 |

*Answers to this question: What, besides help from people, would you want to aid you in Area 3?

TABLE XIX. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY SCHOOL SIZE,
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 1*, PAGE A13
(Area 4)

| Answer | Enrollment | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-------|
| | 700-999 | 1000-1299 | 1300-1599 | 1600-1899 | 1900-2199 | 2200-2499 | 2500 or More | |
| NONE | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 4 |
| LITTLE | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 5 |
| SOME | 8 | 9 | 7 | 11 | 5 | 11 | 4 | 55 |
| MOST | 3 | 10 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 40 |
| ALL | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | 3 |
| No Response | - | 5 | - | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 13 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 26 | 13 | 26 | 13 | 15 | 15 | 120 |

*If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated: What part of these funds do you think should be spent to help operate special programs for in-school youth?

TABLE XX. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY COLLEGE PERCENTAGE,*
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 1, PAGE A13

(Area 4)

| Answer | College Percentage | | | | | Total |
|-------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 0-19 | 20-39 | 40-59 | 60-79 | 80-100 | |
| NONE | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | - | 4 |
| LITTLE | - | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | 5 |
| SOME | 5 | 19 | 22 | 6 | 3 | 55 |
| MOST | 4 | 11 | 22 | 3 | - | 40 |
| ALL | - | 1 | 2 | - | - | 3 |
| No Response | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 12 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 38 | 52 | 13 | 4 | 119** |

*College percentage: percent of last year's graduating class that entered college.

**Since one school did not give its college percentage, the Grand Total was 120.

TABLE XXI. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY PERCENT OF DROP-OUTS,*
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 1, PAGE A13

(Area 4)

| Answer | Percent of Drop-Outs | | | | | Total |
|-------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|-------|
| | 0-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40 or More | |
| NONE | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | 4 |
| LITTLE | - | 3 | 1 | - | - | 4 |
| SOME | 14 | 16 | 15 | 3 | 4 | 52 |
| MOST | 11 | 14 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 37 |
| ALL | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | 3 |
| No Response | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| TOTAL | 32 | 36 | 28 | 9 | 6 | 111** |

*Percent of drop-outs: percent of those who entered the 9th grade in 1959 and are not now attending school.

**Since 9 schools did not give their percent of drop-outs, the Grand Total was 120.

TABLE XXII. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY SCHOOL SIZE,
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 1*, PAGE A14

(Area 5)

| Answer | Enrollment | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-------|
| | 700- 999 | 1000- 1299 | 1300- 1599 | 1600- 1899 | 1900- 2199 | 2200- 2499 | 2500 or More | |
| NONE | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| LITTLE | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | - | - | 7 |
| SOME | 6 | 13 | 7 | 14 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 63 |
| MOST | 2 | 8 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 28 |
| ALL | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 4 |
| No Response | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 26 | 13 | 26 | 13 | 15 | 15 | 120 |

*If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated: What part of these funds do you think should be spent to help operate special programs for out-of-school youth?

TABLE XXIII. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY COLLEGE PERCENTAGE,*
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 1, PAGE A14

(Area 5)

| Answer | College Percentage | | | | | | Total |
|-------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--|-------|
| | 0-19 | 20-39 | 40-59 | 60-79 | 80-100 | | |
| NONE | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | - | | 8 |
| LITTLE | - | 5 | - | 2 | - | | 7 |
| SOME | 5 | 17 | 31 | 6 | 3 | | 62 |
| MOST | 3 | 11 | 12 | 2 | - | | 28 |
| ALL | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | - | | 4 |
| No Response | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | | 10 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 38 | 52 | 13 | 4 | | 119** |

*College percentage: percent of last year's graduating class that entered college.

**Since one school did not give its college percentage, the Grand Total was 120.

TABLE XXIV. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY PERCENT OF DROP-OUTS,*
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 1, PAGE A14

(Area 5)

| Answer | Percent of Drop-Outs | | | | | Total |
|-------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|-------|
| | 0-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40 or More | |
| NONE | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | 8 |
| LITTLE | 3 | 1 | 3 | - | - | 7 |
| SOME | 15 | 20 | 17 | 3 | 4 | 59 |
| MOST | 4 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 26 |
| ALL | 1 | 3 | - | - | - | 4 |
| No Response | 5 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 7 |
| TOTAL | 32 | 36 | 28 | 9 | 6 | 111** |

*Percent of drop-outs: percent of those who entered the 9th grade in 1959 and are not now attending school.

**Since 9 schools did not give their percent of drop-outs, the Grand Total was 120.

TABLE XXV. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY SCHOOL SIZE,
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 1*, PAGE A15

(Area 6)

| Answer | Enrollment | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-------|
| | 700-999 | 1000-1299 | 1300-1599 | 1600-1899 | 1900-2199 | 2200-2499 | 2500 or More | |
| NONE | - | 3 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| LITTLE | 1 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 21 |
| SOME | 6 | 12 | 7 | 16 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 62 |
| MOST | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 | - | 2 | 6 | 22 |
| ALL | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| No Response | - | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 26 | 13 | 26 | 13 | 15 | 15 | 120 |

*If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated: What part of these funds do you think should be spent to help provide more adequate vocational guidance to in-school and out-of-school youth in your community?

TABLE XXVI. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY COLLEGE PERCENTAGE,*
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 1, PAGE A15

(Area 6)

| Answer | College Percentage | | | | | Total |
|-------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 0-19 | 20-39 | 40-59 | 60-79 | 80-100 | |
| NONE | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | - | 7 |
| LITTLE | 3 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 20 |
| SOME | 5 | 18 | 29 | 8 | 2 | 62 |
| MOST | 2 | 7 | 12 | 1 | - | 22 |
| ALL | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| No Response | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 38 | 52 | 13 | 4 | 119** |

*College percentage: percent of last year's graduating class that entered college.

**Since one school did not give its college percentage, the Grand Total was 120.

TABLE XXVII. OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY PERCENT OF DROP-OUTS,*
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 1, PAGE A15

(Area 6)

| Answer | Percent of Drop-Outs | | | | | Total |
|-------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|-------|
| | 0-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40 or More | |
| NONE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | - | 7 |
| LITTLE | 7 | 5 | 5 | 1 | - | 18 |
| SOME | 16 | 20 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 58 |
| MOST | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 22 |
| ALL | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| No Response | 3 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 6 |
| TOTAL | 32 | 36 | 28 | 9 | 6 | 111** |

*Percent of drop-outs: percent of those who entered the 9th grade in 1959 and are not now attending school.

**Since 9 schools did not give their percent of drop-outs, the Grand Total was 120.

TABLE XXVIII. HELP PREFERRED BY PRINCIPALS
IN AREAS 4, 5, AND 6

| Type of Help | Percent Answering Yes* | | |
|---|------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|
| | Area 4 | Area 5 | Area 6 |
| More and better instructors (counselors in Area 6) | 68 | 64 | 76 |
| More and better supervision and administration programs | 45 | 50 | 47 |
| More and better instructional materials (guidance materials in Area 6) | 81 | 77 | 77 |
| More and better equipment | 79 | 73 | not listed for Area 6 |
| More consultation services | 70 | 72 | |
| Number answering** | 111 | 105 | 92 |

*See Appendix, question 2, page A13; question 2, page A14; question 2, page A15.

**The percentages listed are of the number of principals who answered SOME, MOST, or ALL, for that particular area.

TABLE XXIX. WHAT SCHOOLS HAVE DONE
ABOUT THREE TYPES OF ACTIVITIES IN AREA 1

| Have you done any of these within the past two years in your school? | Answers | | |
|---|---------|----|-------------|
| | Yes | No | No Response |
| A follow-up study of graduates | 79 | 31 | 10 |
| A follow-up study of drop-outs | 43 | 48 | 29 |
| A conference of teachers, employers, parents, and others, on the role of the school in educating the employment- bound youth | 46 | 44 | 30 |

TABLE XXX. HOW OFTEN PRINCIPALS INVOLVE OTHERS,*
FROM OUTSIDE THE SCHOOL, IN AREA 1

| | Answer* | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| | <u>All the Time</u> | <u>Most of the Time</u> | <u>Usually</u> | <u>Sometimes</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>No Response</u> |
| Number of Principals | 7 | 10 | 14 | 69 | 17 | 3 |
| | | | | | | 120 |

*Answers to this question: How often are the business and industrial interests, the youth agencies, the employment agencies of the community, involved in examining you school's goals and evaluating its offerings?

TABLE XXXI. WHAT SCHOOLS HAVE DONE ABOUT
THREE TYPES OF SURVEYS IN AREA 2

| Have you done any of these within the past two years in your school? | Answers | | |
|--|---------|----|-------------|
| | Yes | No | No Response |
| A survey to find out the needs of in-school youth individually and as a group | 44 | 51 | 25 |
| A survey to find out the needs of out-of-school youth individually and as a group | 23 | 68 | 29 |
| A survey of the area where your students look for work to see what jobs are available, what skills are needed for these jobs, and what employers expect of beginning employees | 58 | 46 | 16 |

TABLE XXXII. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS HAVING
VARIOUS PROGRAMS IN OPERATION

| Program | Answers | | |
|--|---------|----|-------------|
| | Yes | No | No Response |
| Slow readers and slow learners—to give them a saleable skill | 82 | 30 | 8 |
| After-school-hours program for out-of-school youth | 31 | 70 | 19 |
| Area vocational program | 16 | 84 | 20 |
| Specifically for potential drop-outs | 31 | 65 | 24 |
| Specifically for employment-bound youth | 66 | 38 | 16 |

TABLE XXXIII. HOW OFTEN PRINCIPALS INVOLVE OTHERS,*
FROM OUTSIDE THE SCHOOL, IN AREA 3

| | Answer* | | | | | | Total |
|----------------------|--------------|------------------|---------|-----------|-------|-------------|-------|
| | All the Time | Most of the Time | Usually | Sometimes | Never | No Response | |
| Number of Principals | 7 | 12 | 14 | 59 | 21 | 7 | 120 |

*Answer to this question: How often do you ask the business and industrial interests of your community, both labor and management, to help develop new programs for employment-bound youth?

TABLE XXXIV. ANSWERS TO VARIOUS QUESTIONS
ABOUT EXISTING CONDITIONS FOR EMPLOYMENT-BOUND YOUTH

| Questions | Answers | | |
|---|---------|----|-------------|
| | Yes | No | No Response |
| Do you accept as a goal for your school the responsibility for giving employment-bound youth saleable skills? | 109 | 5 | 6 |
| Do you believe your faculty accepts this as a goal of your school? | 84 | 23 | 13 |
| Is this goal reflected in the courses you offer? | 87 | 21 | 12 |
| Do you feel that your school is presently doing all that can be expected of it for employment-bound in-school youth? | 19 | 95 | 6 |
| Do you feel that your school is presently doing all that can be expected of it for employment-seeking out-of-school youth? | 22 | 90 | 8 |
| Do you think the majority of your teachers look upon the vocational courses as a dumping ground for the "less gifted" youth? | 45 | 68 | 7 |
| Do you feel you have time to give leadership to the development and operation of more effective programs for employment-bound youth? | 46 | 66 | 8 |
| Could the employment-bound youth programs in your school be improved by using reallocated funds to provide an extra assistant whose job would be to give leadership to the program? | 89 | 20 | 11 |

APPENDIX

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DATE: May 3, 1963

TO: Selected High School Principals in Michigan

FROM: Ralph C. Wenrich, Chairman
Department of Vocational Education and Practical Arts

SUBJECT: A Study of High School Principals' Views on What Is Needed
in Order to Provide More Adequate Programs for Employment-Bound Youth

The University of Michigan, in cooperation with the Michigan State Board of Control for Vocational Education, is engaged in a study to learn about the kinds of assistance high school principals would consider to be most helpful in developing and/or operating special programs and services for employment-bound youth.

In a study done in 1961 by The University of Michigan, about two-thirds of the school administrators questioned thought that if state and federal vocational funds were no longer used to support the present high school vocational offerings, these funds should be used to stimulate the future development of new vocational programs and services for high school youth.

This study, therefore, is designed to determine the kinds of assistance you, as a high school principal, consider to be essential in order to provide better educational experiences appropriate to the needs of employment-bound youth.

Questionnaires are numbered merely to enable us to follow up those who are tardy in their responses. Please be assured that YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL. Reports and analyses of data will not identify individuals, schools or school systems.

A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for the return of your questionnaire. Your cooperation in returning this questionnaire as soon as possible will be greatly appreciated.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. For most questions no writing is needed; just check the answer that fits each item best.
2. Feel free to write in any comments or explanations.
3. In some questions we have added lines for written answers; you may use all the space between questions to write your answer, and if you need more space, you may use the back of the page.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

May 17, 1963

SUBJECT: EMPLOYMENT-BOUND YOUTH QUESTIONNAIRE

About two weeks ago we mailed you a copy of the enclosed letter and questionnaire. Since your completed questionnaire has not been received, we are assuming that the first copy sent has been either mismailed or misplaced.

Your opinions on this subject are needed in order to make the study as valid as possible. Even though there is a possibility you have sent in this questionnaire before, please fill out this one and return it soon. Enclosed is a self-addressed, stamped envelope which may be used to return the questionnaire.

A QUESTIONNAIRE OF
HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' VIEWS ON
IMPROVING PROGRAMS FOR EMPLOYMENT-BOUND YOUTH

1. How many grades are there in your school?

- ☐ 3 grades (10-12)
- ☐ 4 grades (9-12)
- ☐ 6 grades (7-12)
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

2. What is the enrollment in your school?

- ☐ 700-999
- ☐ 1000-1299
- ☐ 1300-1599
- ☐ 1600-1899
- ☐ 1900-2199
- ☐ 2200-2499
- ☐ 2500 or more

3. What percentage of last year's graduating class, including boys and girls, entered college?

- ☐ 0-19% entered college.
- ☐ 20-39% " "
- ☐ 40-59% " "
- ☐ 60-79% " "
- ☐ 80-100% " "

4. What percentage of last year's graduating class, including boys and girls, sought employment?

- ☐ 0-19% sought employment.
- ☐ 20-39% " "
- ☐ 40-59% " "
- ☐ 60-79% " "
- ☐ 80-100% " "

5. What percentage of last year's graduating class, including boys and girls, found employment?

- ☐ 0-19% found employment.
- ☐ 20-39% " "
- ☐ 40-59% " "
- ☐ 60-79% " "
- ☐ 80-100% " "

6. What percentage of last year's graduating class, including boys and girls, went into the armed service?

- ☐ 0-4% went into armed service.
- ☐ 5-9% " " " "
- ☐ 10-14% " " " "
- ☐ 15-19% " " " "
- ☐ 20-100% " " " "

7. What is your school's percentage of drop-outs over the four-year high school period? Please estimate this percentage in this manner: how many students who enrolled in the ninth grade in 1959 are not now attending any school? Those of you in schools with grades 10-12 will have to estimate how many dropped out during the ninth grade.

- ☐ 0-9% dropped out of school.
- ☐ 10-19% " " " "
- ☐ 20-29% " " " "
- ☐ 30-39% " " " "
- ☐ 40% or more, dropped out of school.

Examining the goals of the school and evaluating the offerings available to employment-bound youth.

1. Have any of these been done within the past two years in your school?

Yes No

- ☐ ☐ A follow-up study of graduates
- ☐ ☐ A follow-up study of drop-outs
- ☐ ☐ A conference of teachers, employers, parents, etc., on the role of the school in educating the employment-bound youth.

2. How often are the business and industrial interests, the youth agencies, and the employment agencies of the community, involved in examining your school's goals and evaluating its offerings? (Check one)

- ☐ All the time
- ☐ Most of the time
- ☐ Usually
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Never

3. If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated:

What part of these funds do you think should be spent to help evaluate the offerings and examine the goals of your school? (Check one)

- ☐ NONE. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need help in other areas, not this one.
- ☐ LITTLE. I am satisfied with what we are now doing to evaluate our offerings and examine our goals.
- ☐ SOME. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need help in this and in other areas.
- ☐ MOST. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need a lot of help here, but we need help in other areas also.
- ☐ ALL. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, this is the first thing our school must do.

If you checked one of these, turn to Page A9

If you checked one of these, turn to Page A8

4. If help were given by making it possible for one or more individuals to work on examining the school's goals and evaluating the school's offerings, indicate who you think should do this by checking each of the following either Yes or No. Write in your choice if it is not listed.

| Yes | No | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Members of your staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | A group of principals from other schools |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Personnel from the State Department of Public Instruction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Individuals from the community (representing labor, management, parents, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | A consultant or survey team from a college or university |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| | | Other (please specify) |

5. What, besides help from people, would you want to aid you in examining the school's goals and evaluating its offerings? Please check each of the following either Yes or No. Write in your choice if not listed.

| Yes | No | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Sample evaluation forms |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Standards to evaluate by |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Written plan or procedure to carry on such activities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| | | Other (please specify) |

Assessing the needs of in-school and out-of-school youth
and the needs of employers.

1. Have you done any of these within the past two years in your school?

Yes No

- ☐ ☐ A survey to find out (identify) the needs of in-school youth individually and as a group.
- ☐ ☐ A survey to find out (identify) the needs of out-of-school youth individually and as a group.
- ☐ ☐ A survey of the area where your students look for work to see what jobs are available, what skills are needed for these jobs, and what employers expect of beginning employees.

2. If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated:

What part of these funds do you think should be spent to help assess the needs of in-school and out-of-school youth and the needs of employers?
(Check one)

- ☐ NONE. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need help in other areas, not this one.
- ☐ LITTLE. I am satisfied with what we are now doing to assess the needs of youth and employers.
- ☐ SOME. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need help in this and in other areas.
- ☐ MOST. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need a lot of help here, but we need help in other areas also.
- ☐ ALL. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, this is the first thing our school must do.

If you
checked one
of these,
turn to
Page A11

If you
checked one
of these,
turn to
Page A10

3. If help were given by making it possible for one or more individuals to work on assessing the needs of youth and employers, indicate who you think should do this by checking each of the following either Yes or No. Write in your choice if it is not listed.

Yes

No

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Members of your staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | A group of principals from other schools |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Personnel from the State Department of Public Instruction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Individuals from the community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | A consultant or survey team from a college or university |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Other (please specify)

4. What, besides the services of people, would you want to help you assess the needs of youth and employers? Please check each of the following either Yes or No. Write in your choice if it is not listed.

Yes

No

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Materials used for assessing youth's needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Materials used for assessing employers' needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Methods to evaluate data after it is collected |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Other (please specify)

Developing new programs to meet the needs of youth and employers.

1. Do you have any of these programs in operation now?

Yes No

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | A program for slow readers and slow learners to give them a saleable skill |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | An after-school-hours program for out-of-school youth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | An area vocational program where several schools have joined together to use available facilities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | A program designed specifically for potential drop-outs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | A program designed specifically for employment-bound youth |

2. How often do you ask the business and industrial interests of your community, both labor and management, to help develop new programs for employment-bound youth? (Check one)

- ☐ All the time
- ☐ Most of the time
- ☐ Usually
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Never

3. If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated:

What part of these funds do you think should be spent to help develop new programs to meet the needs of youth and employers in your community? (Check one)

- ☐ NONE. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need help in other areas, not this one.
- ☐ LITTLE. I am satisfied with the design of the programs we now have.
- ☐ SOME. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need help in this and in other areas.
- ☐ MOST. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need a lot of help here, but we need help in other areas also.
- ☐ ALL. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, this is the first thing our school must do.

If you checked one of these, turn to Page A13

If you checked one of these, turn to Page A12

4. If help were given by making it possible for one or more individuals to work on developing programs to meet the needs of youth and employers in your community, indicate who you think this should be by checking each of the following either Yes or No. Write in your choice if it is not listed.

| Yes | No |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Members of your staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> A group of principals from other schools |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel from the State Department of Public Instruction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Individuals from the community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> A consultant or survey team from a college or university |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ Other (please specify) |

5. What, besides help from people, would you want to aid you in developing programs to meet the needs of youth and employers in your community? Please check each of the following either Yes or No. Write in your choice if it is not listed.

| Yes | No |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> A sample pilot program to study and compare with |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Samples of new instructional materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Information on new or better equipment for such programs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ Other (please specify) |

Operating specialized programs designed to prepare in-school youth for employment.

1. If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated:

What part of these funds do you think should be spent to help operate special programs for in-school youth? (Check one)

- ☐ NONE. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need help in other areas, not this one.
- ☐ LITTLE. I am satisfied that we can operate programs for our in-school youth without aid.
- ☐ SOME. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need help in this and in other areas.
- ☐ MOST. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need a lot of help here, but we need help in other areas also.
- ☐ ALL. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, this is the first thing our school must do.

If you checked one of these, turn to Page A14

If you checked one of these, go on to Question 2 below

2. If assistance were given to help operate specialized programs for employment-bound in-school youth, what kind of assistance would you want? Please check each of the following either Yes or No. Write in your choice if it is not listed.

- | Yes | No | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | More and better instructors |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | More and better supervision and administration of our programs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | More and better instructional materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | More and better equipment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | More consultation services. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| | | Other (please specify) |

Operating specialized programs designed to prepare out-of-school youth for employment.

1. If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated:

What part of these funds do you think should be spent to help operate special programs for out-of-school youth? (Check one)

- ☐ NONE. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need help in other areas, not this one.
- ☐ LITTLE. I am satisfied that we can operate programs for our out-of-school youth without aid.
- ☐ SOME. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need help in this and in other areas.
- ☐ MOST. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need a lot of help here, but we need help in other areas also.
- ☐ ALL. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, this is the first thing our school must do.

If you checked one of these, turn to Page A15

If you checked one of these, go on to Question 2 below

2. If assistance were given to help operate specialized programs for employment-seeking out-of-school youth, what kind of assistance would you want? Please check each of the following either Yes or No. Write in your choice if it is not listed.

Yes

No

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> More and better instructors |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> More and better supervision and administration of such a program |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> More and better instructional materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> More and better equipment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> More consultation services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Other (please specify)

Providing more adequate vocational guidance services
for in-school and out-of-school youth.

1. If state and federal funds earmarked for vocational education were reallocated:

What part of these funds do you think should be spent to help provide more adequate vocational guidance to in-school and out-of-school youth in your community? (Check one)

- ☐ NONE. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need help in other areas, not this one.
- ☐ LITTLE. I am satisfied with the guidance services we now have.
- ☐ SOME. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need help in this and in other areas.
- ☐ MOST. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, we need a lot of help here, but we need help in other areas also.
- ☐ ALL. If we are to improve our program for employment-bound youth, this is the first thing our school must do.

If you checked one of these, turn to Page A16

If you checked one of these, go on to Question 2 below

2. If assistance were given to improve your guidance services, what kind of assistance would you want? Please check each of the following either Yes or No. Write in your choice if it is not listed.

Yes No

- ☐ ☐ More and better prepared counselors aware of the problems of employment-bound youth
- ☐ ☐ More supervisory and administrative help for your guidance services
- ☐ ☐ More and better guidance materials (occupational information, etc.)
- ☐ ☐ _____

Other (please specify)

- | Yes | No | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Do you accept as a goal for your school the responsibility for giving employment-bound youth saleable skills? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Do you believe your faculty accepts this as a goal of your school? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Is this goal reflected in the courses you offer? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Do you feel that your school is presently doing all that can be expected of it for employment-bound in-school youth? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Do you feel that your school is presently doing all that can be expected of it for employment-seeking out-of-school youth? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Do you think the majority of your teachers look upon the vocational courses as a dumping ground for the "less gifted" students? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Do you feel you have time to give leadership to the development and operation of more effective programs for employment-bound youth? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Could the employment-bound youth program in your school be improved by using reallocated funds to provide an extra assistant whose job would be to give leadership to the program? |

This is the last item and thank you for your time and effort. The problems concerning employment-bound youth today are such that assistance is desirable in all areas of programs for them; however, funds will stretch just so far. Therefore, we would like to know if assistance is available in only one area, which would you prefer? Place (1), (2), and (3) before three of the following areas in order of preference for assistance.

Areas Where Assistance Could be Given

- ☐ Examine the goals of your school and evaluate offerings
- ☐ Assess the needs of in-school and out-of-school youth, and employers
- ☐ Develop new programs
- ☐ Operate specialized programs for in-school youth
- ☐ Operate specialized programs for out-of-school youth and adults
- ☐ Provide adequate vocational guidance services